

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS MINUTES

April 8, 2014 – Regular Meeting
Delta Township Administration Building

I CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Reed called the meeting to order.

II PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chairman Reed led the Board and others present in reciting the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

III ROLL CALL

Members Present: Arking, Barnhart, Laforet, Newman, Parr, and Reed

Members Absent: Hicks - excused

Others Present: Chris Gruba, Assistant Planner and Community Development
Director Mark Graham

IV SET AND ADJUST AGENDA

Mr. Reed asked if there were any changes to the agenda.

Mr. Gruba said there were no changes.

V APPROVAL OF MINUTES

**MOTION BY PARR, SECONDED BY ARKING, THAT THE FEBRUARY 11, 2014
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES BE APPROVED. VOICE VOTE. CARRIED 6-0.**

VI OLD BUSINESS - None

VII NEW BUSINESS

Zoning Ordinance Appeal of the Zoning Administrator's Decision: Ms. Cosima Hall, owner of the property at 408 Burgenstock, is seeking an appeal of the Zoning Administrator's decision regarding Section 18.6.0 (D) of the Zoning Ordinance regarding home occupations.

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS REGULAR MEETING OF APRIL 8, 2014 P. 2

Mr. Gruba informed the Board that staff had been contacted by Buckthorne Management Services who managed Verndale Lakes Condominiums who inquired whether a home occupation would be allowed within the condominium development. Mr. Gruba noted that Buckthorne Management was informed that home occupations were not permitted within two-family dwellings. He said after John Hall contacted the Township's Zoning Administrator, Mark Graham, regarding his wife's art classes being conducted from their home, Mr. Graham informed Mr. Hall that Mrs. Hall's art classes constituted a home occupation as defined in the Zoning Ordinance. Mr. Gruba noted that subsequently, Mr. & Mrs. Hall filed an appeal of the Zoning Administrator's decision. Mr. Gruba informed the Board that staff had not received any objections from the neighbors regarding this matter, but the Township was in receipt of several letters in favor of allowing Mrs. Hall to continue her art classes from her home.

Ms. Laforet informed the Board that she had taken art classes from Mrs. Hall and had many friends who were in attendance this evening; however, she felt she could act fairly this evening.

None of the Board members expressed any concerns with Ms. Laforet participating in this evening's case.

Mr. Arking questioned whether staff felt the only question before the Board this evening was whether Mr. Graham interpreted the Zoning Ordinance correctly and not how the ordinance should read.

Mr. Gruba felt that was a fair assessment.

Mr. Newman said Mr. Graham's memo of March 27, 2014 made reference to a section of the Michigan Zoning Enabling Act that allowed piano lessons to be conducted in the home and he questioned how that was different than art instruction.

Mr. Gruba said the Michigan Zoning Enabling Act stated that those types of activities were permitted, but the Township was permitted to regulate such activities.

Mr. Newman asked if he would be permitted to conduct piano lessons in his home.

Mr. Gruba noted that if it had been determined that piano lessons qualified as a home occupation within a single family home, the home owner would be required to apply for a special land use permit.

Mr. Newman questioned how piano lessons were different than the art classes being conducted by the applicant.

Mr. Gruba said the only difference was that the applicant lived in a two-family dwelling

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS REGULAR MEETING OF APRIL 8, 2014 P. 3

rather than a single family home.

Mr. Newman questioned if the applicant would be permitted to operate her art classes if she obtained permission from the management company.

Mr. Gruba said the applicant would not be permitted to operate her art classes even with approval from the management company due to the regulations contained in the Zoning Ordinance that prohibited home occupations in two-family dwellings.

Ms. Parr said the applicant lived within a condominium development and that each dwelling unit had separate legal descriptions and separate tax bills. Ms. Parr felt that even though the condominium units were attached rather than detached, she felt they were different than two-family dwellings.

Mr. Arking said he wanted to make sure the Board didn't put themselves into a situation where they were attempting to make determinations as to whether a property was zoned for multi-family in some instances and not for others. He felt it had to be clear cut for all zoning purposes.

Ms. Laforet felt the subject parcel was zoned single family residential due to the fact that the condominium units were single family attached dwellings that had separate deeds and two different tax parcel numbers, even though the units were attached. Ms. Laforet noted that one unit could be foreclosed on and it wouldn't encumber the entire property, whereas a two-family dwelling had one deed and one legal description and was zoned multiple family. Ms. Laforet said she understood Mr. Graham's conservative interpretation, but she felt the subject parcel was a single family dwelling as to how it was zoned and how it was taxed rather than a two-family dwelling.

Mr. Graham said the definition of two-family dwellings in the Zoning Ordinance is "a detached building designed exclusively for and containing two dwelling units only". He noted that the definition didn't include language pertaining to legal descriptions, separate entrances, or individual driveways. Mr. Graham said Ms. Parr's and Ms. Laforet's points were well taken, but he was bound by the existing language in the Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Barnhart noted that he lived within the Verndale Lakes development that was located on the north side of St. Joe Highway, north of the subject parcel and he was familiar with the process of homeowners receiving a copy of the association's by-laws at the time they purchased their homes. Mr. Barnhart indicated that Article Six of the by-laws states that each unit in the development shall only be used for those purposes which are permissible under the applicable Township ordinances and that the common element shall be used only for the purpose consistent with the use of residential units. A business may be conducted in a unit provided it didn't violate the applicable zoning ordinance and the owner obtained written approval from the Association's Board of Directors.

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS REGULAR MEETING OF APRIL 8, 2014 P. 4

Mr. Reed said the Board was addressing Mr. Graham's interpretation this evening rather than the homeowner's association's by-laws.

Mr. Barnhart said the reason why he brought up the Association's by-laws was due to the relevance made in regards to compliance with the Township's Ordinances.

Mr. Newman questioned whether the definition of a single family residential dwelling within the Zoning Ordinance addressed condominium units.

Mr. Graham said nowhere in the Zoning Ordinance does it mention ownership. He noted that the Zoning Ordinance defined condominium units as a portion of a condominium development designed and intended for separate ownership and uses described in the master deed regardless of whether it was intended for residential, office, industrial, business, recreational, a time-share unit, or any other type of use. He said a condominium may consist of either vacant land or space with either enclosures or enclosed by building structure. Mr. Graham said the definition of a single family dwelling is "a detached building designed exclusively for and containing one dwelling unit only".

Ms. Parr inquired about the difference between bridge clubs meeting at a home every week and Mrs. Hall's art classes.

Mr. Graham said this was a very fine line and that the Township had had numerous instances where bible classes were being held in a home and, based on a decision by the US Supreme Court, staff had been instructed by the Township's Attorney to be very careful about the regulation of bible classes in the home. Mr. Graham gave the Commission examples of the types of uses that he had encountered in the past years where he took the position that a home occupation permit was needed due to the fact that the use generated traffic to the home. He indicated that there were social settings such as poker clubs, bridge clubs, and that sort of thing that were not required to obtain a permit. However, he noted that if parking became a problem within a neighborhood, staff would call the Sheriff's Department who could ticket vehicles. Mr. Graham noted that piano lessons had never been brought to his attention, but piano lessons often took place where it's one on one and that traffic generation to the home may have not been a problem that neighbors wanted to bring to the Township's attention.

Mr. Arking said putting traffic issues aside; he felt the heart of a home occupation was commerce activity rather than defining what that commerce activity was. He felt there was going to be some commercial activity which was the reason behind a home occupation; otherwise it could be considered just a social gathering.

Mr. Graham said he agreed to an extent and that the home occupation regulations contained in the Zoning Ordinance don't mention the taking of money or financial remuneration. Mr. Graham noted that he had researched six other ordinances in the Greater Lansing area and the City of East Lansing was the only one that referred to the issue of money within their home

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS REGULAR MEETING OF APRIL 8, 2014 P. 5

occupation regulations. He noted that Section 18.6.0 of the Zoning Ordinance gave the Zoning Administrator the responsibility of determining what constituted a home occupation. The Zoning Ordinance states that “the Zoning Administrator shall determine whether or not a use shall be required to obtain a special land use permit in order to operate as a home occupation. If in the opinion of the Zoning Administrator the proposed home business activity dose generate traffic to the property, or create noise, dust, vibrations, odor, smoke, glare, electrical interference, fire hazard, to a greater extent than normal or a substantial increase in use of services such as water, sanitary sewer, storm drainage, or garbage collection, the activities may be conducted within a home without having to obtain a special land use permit for a home occupation”. Mr. Graham said the rule of thumb that he had used over the years in determining whether a permit was needed or not had always been the generation of traffic to the home because that was how neighbors were typically alerted to the activity. Mr. Graham said the applicant had indicated that her art classes generated traffic to the home and that she had taken many steps to reduce the traffic to her home such as having clients walk to her home, car pool, or park in the driveway.

Mr. Arking said he agreed with Mr. Graham’s interpretation, but he felt ultimately there would be a problem if this case was ever challenged because without commerce entering into the equation, it would be difficult distinguishing between a home occupation and a social gathering.

Ms. Laforet asked staff to provide the definition of a two-family dwelling again.

Mr. Graham said the definition contained in the Zoning Ordinance read that “a detached building designed exclusively for and containing two dwelling units only”. He said the definition of dwelling unit states that “a building or enclosed portion thereof designed for occupancy by one family for residential purposes and having independent living, eating, sleeping, cooking, and sanitary facilities”.

MOTION BY NEWMAN, SECONDED BY PARR, THAT THE MEETING BE OPENED UP FOR PUBLIC COMMENTS. VOICE VOTE. CARRIED 6-0.

Michele Holmberg, 411 Burkenstock, said that Mina Hall was her neighbor and friend and she felt tremendously grateful and fortunate to have her as a neighbor. Ms. Holmberg noted that Mina’s talent and expertise as a true artist was very rare in this area and that her love of art was her life and she lived and breathed it everyday. Ms. Holmberg said as her neighbor, she was lucky to be able to learn from her because Mina wanted to share this beauty of life. Ms. Holmberg said last June, she retired from Lansing Community College after 29 years in the library and she now wanted to improve her skills in oil painting. Ms. Holmberg said she was lucky enough to be able to walk across the street and join a group of friends and paint while being guided by a true artist. Ms. Holmberg said they were simply a group of people that enjoyed art and she didn’t feel the art classes were any different than a book club, a piano lesson, or many other types of get-togethers that people had in their homes. Ms.

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS REGULAR MEETING OF APRIL 8, 2014 P. 6

Holmberg noted that there may be two or three vehicles parked at the residence at one time and that she had seen many more parked at several other homes that she had to maneuver around as she returned to, or left her own home. Ms. Holmberg said she wasn't complaining about these situations, but she was simply stating that much worse occurred and to make an issue of Mina's visits by her friends was a shame. She noted that the area was very fortunate to have an artist of her caliber within the Township and that Mina deserved to be treated with respect. Ms. Holmberg asked the Board to put everything into perspective and allow Mina to continue her life's work of helping others feed their souls through art.

Pat Horan, 409 Burgenstock, said she lived across the street from Mina. Ms. Horan noted that she didn't take art lessons from Mina; however, she owned two of her paintings that were exquisite. Ms. Horan indicated that Mina had been holding her art classes since she moved into the neighborhood without incident and she felt the Township should be proud that the area had such a fine artist residing here. Ms. Horan felt this caused discord within the close knit association which made her very sad.

Howard Pizzo, 1027 Red Cliff Drive, said he first met Mina a couple of years ago when he took art lessons from her. He noted that Mina was a recognized professional artist who had trained in Italy. Mr. Pizzo said he learned a lot from Mina and was pleased with her guidance and felt everyone else was who had attended her classes. Mr. Pizzo said he would like to focus on the issue of a two-family versus a single family dwelling and noted that the homes in Mina's neighborhood were large and that they just shared a common wall. He noted that Mina's driveway happened to be longer than the other driveways in the area and it would actually easily accommodate four cars if there was a need. Mr. Pizzo felt it was reasonable to reverse the decision of the Zoning Administrator since the classes were not held daily, but rather they were held periodically during the week and the number of additional cars per week was not excessive. He said there were no irritating noises or any other issues emanating from the classes and that staff had not received any complaints from the neighbors, but rather the homeowners association had asked for clarification which he didn't view as a complaint, but rather they were doing their due diligence. Mr. Pizzo said the discussion of what was the meaning of the ordinance in terms of limiting a fine arts class was really an important issue to recognize that this was fine arts which he didn't feel the homeowners association was aware of the possibility of an exemption for this type of class. Mr. Pizzo said he viewed the art classes as a reasonable allowance to grant Mina approval to continue her art classes.

Jennet Pizzo, 340 Old Lansing Road, stated that Mina was a friend of hers and that she was a very well known artist that had had art exhibits all over the world. Ms. Pizzo said she felt honored that Mina was sharing her talent. Ms. Pizzo informed the Board that her classes were very small and that there was usually only four to five students at the most that met for two hours. Ms. Pizzo noted that Mina's students were very conscientious of where they parked to make sure they didn't block driveways or mail boxes. Ms. Pizzo felt it would be a shame if Mina had to discontinue sharing her talent.

Mary Best, 322 Cortina Trail, said she understood the legal problem that the Board had and that the primary issue seemed to be traffic being generated to and from the home. Ms. Best noted that although she didn't live on Mina's street, she had been friends with her for eight years and she noted that there was more traffic on Cortina Trail from her neighbors coming and going with normal daily activities than there had ever been on Mina's street. Ms. Best hoped that the Board would consider the minimal amount of traffic coming and going from Mina's house as a result of the art classes.

Mina Greco Hall, 408 Burgenstock, stated that if she was a business person, she would have opened a larger facility and not operated out of her home. Ms. Hall noted that she was respectful to her neighbors and didn't want to generate a large amount of traffic through the neighborhood. She noted that none of her neighbors had complained about her art classes.

John Hall, 408 Burgenstock, said the biblical observation was "Is man made for the Sabbath or is Sabbath made for man?" He felt the same thing could be asked, are ordinances made for man, or are man made for ordinances. Mr. Hall said there should be a way in which whatever had been decreed as an ordinance could be modified or litigated in some respect. He felt this was a good case where there should be some mitigation allowed.

MOTION BY PARR, SECONDED BY LAFORET, THAT THE PUBLIC HEARING BE CLOSED. VOICE VOTE. CARRIED 6-0.

Following up on a request by Ms. Laforet, Mr. Gruba noted that the subject parcel was zoned RB, Low Density Residential which allowed two-family dwellings with a special land use permit. Mr. Gruba noted that staff had referred to the use of the property and not the zoning classification.

Ms. Laforet questioned if the property was being taxed as a two-family dwelling, or a single family home.

Mr. Gruba said the properties were two different parcels.

Mr. Barnhart said he lived within the Verndale Lakes development and that he paid his own taxes and utilities.

Ms. Laforet felt a two-family dwelling, as defined in the Zoning Ordinance, was contradictory to the zoning and how each parcel was taxed and the way it was deeded. Ms. Laforet said because there was such an inconsistency as a result of there not being additional traffic coming to the area and the fact that no one had issued a complaint, but rather the management company had requested clarification, she viewed the art classes as being a non-issue.

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS REGULAR MEETING OF APRIL 8, 2014 P. 8

Mr. Gruba noted that when staff was contacted by the management company inquiring about Ms. Hall's art classes, they were concerned about the legal aspect of people coming to the home and the liability if someone was injured.

Ms. Laforet said she saw it more as an inquiry from the management company rather than a complaint.

Mr. Reed said having reviewed the written materials and discussions with staff, he questioned whether the Zoning Board of Appeals was attempting to modify the Zoning Ordinance to fix a particular problem, in this case being Mr. Graham's interpretation, or whether the Board was here to render a decision based on Mr. Graham's interpretation. Mr. Reed noted that this evening's request reminded him of another request the Zoning Board of Appeals had reviewed and he didn't know whether it was the Zoning Board of Appeal's job to define, or rewrite, the Zoning Ordinance when there was ambiguity in the Zoning Ordinance, but rather it was the responsibility of the Township Board. Mr. Reed said he agreed with Mr. Graham's interpretation and that the ordinance was clear in its definition of a two-family dwelling. Mr. Reed didn't feel it had anything to do with whether the applicant was a good artist or a small business person, but rather a precedence could be set for every business in a two-family dwelling if the Zoning Board of Appeals reversed Mr. Graham's interpretation and that the Township Board should determine whether or not the Zoning Ordinance should be amended.

Mr. Arking said once again he found himself facing one of these awkward and painful decisions where the Zoning Ordinance was failing the citizens. He felt this was another case where the Zoning Ordinance needed a better definition and better exemption. Mr. Arking felt the Zoning Ordinance needed to be updated so it better served the residents and only the Township Board could do that. Mr. Arking encouraged the audience to support Ms. Hall's activity and to join in urging the Township Board to update the ordinance.

Ms. Laforet said she agreed with Mr. Arking that many of the standards contained in the Zoning Ordinance needed to be reviewed because of situations like this. However, she didn't feel a two-family dwelling was something that was occupied by two families because a duplex had only one deed. She said because of the way the Township was taxing the subject parcel as two separate parcels, she would argue that the subject parcel was not a two-family dwelling and did not fall under the definition of a two-family dwelling. Ms. Laforet said with her experience as a realtor, a two-family dwelling had always been considered as a property that had one legal description and the fact that the subject parcel had two separate legal descriptions and two separate tax parcel numbers,. She felt given the inconsistency of the way the subject parcel was being taxed, that an exemption should be made in this case until the Township Board could take it up and define otherwise.

Mr. Barnhart said he lived in Verndale Lakes and he had his own deed and paid his own taxes and the unit attached to his unit did the same thing which he felt constituted a two-

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS REGULAR MEETING OF APRIL 8, 2014 P. 9

family dwelling.

Mr. Arking said he would be in favor of a standard in the Zoning Ordinance that gave Mr. Graham the ability to interpret a two-family dwelling based on how it was taxed, but there wasn't and that Mr. Graham was obligated to interpret the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance and the physical makeup of the building.

Ms. Parr said she would be in favor of sending this to the Township Board for an interpretation.

Mr. Reed said if the Zoning Board of Appeals tabled the request this evening, he questioned what staff's recommendation to the applicant would be.

Mr. Graham said Ms. Hall had been very cooperative and she had indicated in her letter to the Zoning Board of Appeals that she wouldn't continue teaching her art classes until a decision was made on her appeal. Mr. Graham cautioned the Zoning Board of Appeals about sending this request to the Township Board for an interpretation. He informed the Zoning Board of Appeals that Section 20.3.2 of the Zoning Ordinance specifically gave the Zoning Board of Appeals the responsibility of interpreting the Zoning Ordinance, not the Township Board. Mr. Graham felt the Zoning Board of Appeals could pass a motion this evening noting their concerns and ask the Township Board to conduct an analysis which they had done in the past.

Mr. Reed felt that whatever motion was presented this evening, the Zoning Board of Appeals needed to have an affirmative decision as to whether they agreed with Mr. Graham's interpretation or not.

Mr. Graham said that was correct. He noted that the Zoning Board of Appeals could table the request this evening until such time as the Township Board amended the Zoning Ordinance. Mr. Graham reminded the Zoning Board of Appeals that the Township was in the process of hiring a consultant to rewrite the entire Zoning Ordinance and that he had authored a memo to the Township Board that contained issues to be considered in reviewing the Zoning Ordinance and that the definition of a two-family dwelling unit was one of the issues to be reviewed. However, he noted that the Zoning Board of Appeals had a decision to make this evening as to whether or not the applicant's art classes constituted a home occupation and not whether their home constituted a two-family dwelling. Mr. Graham noted that the Zoning Board of Appeals could reverse his decision and rule that the art classes was not a home occupation which would enable the applicant to continue, but if the Zoning Board of Appeals rules that the art classes constituted a home occupation, then the applicant could file an appeal as to whether or not her home was a single family dwelling or a two-family dwelling. Mr. Graham noted that tonight's venue was to determine whether he made the correct decision.

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS REGULAR MEETING OF APRIL 8, 2014 P. 10

Ms. Laforet said given the fact that she didn't necessarily feel the art classes was an occupation which the applicant was conducting in order to make a living, but rather a hobby that she was sharing with others, she felt Mr. Graham's interpretation should be reversed because she didn't see the art classes as a home occupation. Ms. Laforet also agreed that when the Zoning Ordinance was rewritten, that the definition of "occupation" should be further clarified because at the present time, the definition of "occupation" contained in the Zoning Ordinance was vague.

Mr. Reed said the definition of "home occupation" that was provided by staff read "any occupation conducted entirely within the dwelling, or an enclosed accessory building, carried on by the residents thereof, not involving employees other than members of the immediate family residing in the dwelling, which was clearly secondary to the use of the dwelling for residential purposes".

Ms. Laforet said she didn't feel the art classes were an occupation because they were secondary to the use of residential purposes which would only allow people to live in their home because having guests over for coffee was secondary to the use of the dwelling.

Mr. Arking felt the Zoning Board of Appeals had more of a tool than that because Section 18.6.0 D (1) of the Zoning Ordinance referred to "proposed home business activities". He said the Zoning Ordinance seemed to assume that "occupation" was a business activity and not just any type of activity such as guest coming to a home to play cards. Mr. Arking said that is why he felt there had to be a commerce aspect of a home occupation otherwise it was indiscernible from any other activity.

Mr. Reed said he agreed with Ms. Laforet, but the Zoning Ordinance also states that the proposed home business activity may generate traffic to the property. He said while it's been noted this evening that the applicant's clients were parking in the driveway and that there hadn't been any complaints of vehicles parking in the street, but the Zoning Administrator indicated that whatever was going on in the dwelling was generating traffic to the property which was clearly defined as part of a home occupation.

Ms. Laforet felt having guests to the home was generating traffic to the home, but it wouldn't be an occupation.

Mr. Newman said the Zoning Ordinance also states that a home occupation shall not generate an unduly burdensome amount of traffic. Mr. Newman didn't feel traffic was necessarily defined in the Zoning Ordinance and as per Ms. Laforet's comments, anybody coming to the home would be generating traffic and therefore, based on his interpretation, nobody shall be able to visit the dwelling.

Mr. Arking asked if the applicant charged for her services.

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS REGULAR MEETING OF APRIL 8, 2014 P. 11

Ms. Hall noted that the art classes originally began among a small group of friends. She said her students then began bringing her fruit. She noted that several students began giving her \$5.00 per class as a donation and she finally settled on a rate of \$3.50 per class. Mrs. Hall said that she had been admitted to Sparrow Hospital due to all of the tension this issue had created.

Mr. Arking said the reason why he asked about charging for services was that he was trying to determine whether there was commerce going on in your art classes with his idea of what a home occupation was. He felt the Zoning Ordinance implicitly assumed that there was a business activity, or some type of commerce activity, going on associated with the home activity. He said if there wasn't, he questioned how you determine a home occupation from other activities.

Ms. Hall said the students were voluntarily giving her a donation.

Mr. Arking asked the applicant if she had a set list of fees that she charged.

Ms. Hall said no.

Mr. Arking asked if it would be fair to characterize any money that was exchanging hands as almost insignificant.

Ms. Hall indicated that all of the students were her friends.

Ms. Laforet asked the applicant if she had ever advertised her art classes.

Ms. Hall said no.

MOTION BY PARR, SECONDED BY NEWMAN, THAT THE ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS REVERSE THE ZONING ADMINISTRATOR'S DECISION THAT CONDUCTING ART INSTRUCTION AT 408 BURGENTOCK DRIVE CONSTITUTES A HOME OCCUPATION UNDER THE TERMS OF THE DELTA TOWNSHIP ZONING ORDINANCE. THE FOLLOWING FINDINGS OF FACT REVERSE THE ZONING ADMINISTRATOR'S DECISION:

- 1. THE RESIDENT GIVES INSTRUCTION IN A FINE ART AS PER SECTION 204 OF THE MICHIGAN ZONING ENABLING ACT.**
- 2. THE INTERMITTENT ART INSTRUCTION IS CONDUCTED AS AN EDUCATIONAL ENDEAVOR, NOT A BUSINESS ACTIVITY.**
- 3. DISQUIETING EFFECTS TO NEIGHBORING PROPERTIES HAVE BEEN AVOIDED BY LIMITING THE NUMBER OF STUDENTS IN THE HOME**

TO FOUR AT ANY ONE TIME, MANDATING THAT STUDENT'S VEHICLES BE PARKED IN THE HALL'S DRIVEWAY, LIMITING THE HOURS OF INSTRUCTION AND AVOIDING WEEKENDS/HOLIDAY PERIODS.

Mr. Arking felt there was a big hole in the definition of "home occupation" in the Zoning Ordinance because he didn't feel the art classes constituted a business activity that he would require as a minimum threshold for a home occupation. He said he couldn't tell the difference between what Ms. Hall was doing as a homeowner that had friends over to watch a football game or play cards.

ROLL CALL VOTE. CARRIED 6-0.

Mr. Arking stated that the Township's Zoning Ordinance needed to be amended and he was very happy to hear that the Township was pursuing a consultant to re-write the ordinance. Mr. Arking encouraged the residents that were present this evening to encourage the Township Board to amend the home occupation standards within the ordinance.

VII. NEW BUSINESS – None

IV STAFF COMMENTS - None

Mr. Graham reiterated the fact that the Township was in the process of hiring a consultant to re-write the Township's Zoning Ordinance. Mr. Graham indicated that he had authored a separate report on home occupations and the issue of home occupations and two-family dwellings was open for discussion.

X BOARD COMMENTS

XI ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Reed adjourned the meeting at 7:18 p.m.

DELTA CHARTER TOWNSHIP

Mary Clark, Secretary to the Zoning Board of Appeals